

IDENTIFYING NOMINALIZATION IN ENGLISH REPORT TEXTS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Salmah¹, Alan Jaelani², Indah Sri Rejeki³

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor

salmahpbi@gmail.com, alan.jaelani@uika-bogor.ac.id

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi penggunaan nominalisasi dalam teks report yang ditulis oleh siswa sekolah menengah atas. Fokus penelitian ini diarahkan pada identifikasi tipe-tipe nominalisasi yang digunakan dalam tulisan siswa serta analisis terhadap bentuk nominalisasi yang paling dominan. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan metode analisis isi. Data diperoleh dari dokumentasi teks report berbahasa Inggris yang ditulis oleh siswa kelas XI di salah satu SMA negeri di Bogor. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa siswa menggunakan beragam tipe nominalisasi, dengan tipe perubahan verba menjadi nomina (tipe 2) sebagai bentuk yang paling sering muncul. Temuan ini mencerminkan upaya siswa dalam membangun struktur kalimat yang lebih padat dan formal, meskipun penguasaan terhadap fitur bahasa akademik masih berkembang. Simpulan dari penelitian ini menegaskan pentingnya pengajaran eksplisit mengenai nominalisasi untuk membantu siswa dalam mengembangkan keterampilan menulis akademik yang sesuai dengan karakteristik teks ilmiah. Implikasinya, guru bahasa Inggris disarankan untuk mengintegrasikan latihan-latihan penggunaan nominalisasi dalam pengajaran genre teks report.

Kata kunci: nominalisasi, teks report, siswa SMA, analisis isi, penulisan akademik

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the use of nominalization in report texts written by high school students. The research focuses on identifying the types of nominalization used in students' writing and analyzing the most dominantly employed forms. A qualitative approach was applied using content analysis as the method. The data were collected from English report texts written by eleventh-grade students at a public senior high school in Bogor. The findings reveal that students employed a variety of nominalization types, with the conversion of verbs into nouns (type 2) emerging as the most dominant. This indicates students' efforts to construct more compact and formal sentence structures, even though their mastery of academic language features is still in development. The study concludes that explicit instruction on nominalization is essential to support students in enhancing their academic writing skills. The implication is that English teachers are encouraged to incorporate nominalization practice into teaching report text genres.

Keywords: nominalization, report text, high school students, content analysis, academic writing

INTRODUCTION

Writing is an important skill in English language learning, especially in academic contexts. Report text is one of the genres that students learn because it demands the delivery of information objectively, systematically and formally (Gerot & Wignell, 1994; Knapp & Watkins, 2005). The main challenge in writing report texts is the use of dense and cohesive language structures. One linguistic feature that supports this is nominalization. Nominalization allows students to

transform processes or properties into entities, so that information can be conveyed concisely and formally (Halliday & Martin, 1993).

In practice, many students struggle to meet the linguistic demands of report texts. Their texts often use simple structures, lack information density, and do not reflect academic language style. This suggests that although students have been introduced to various types of texts, they have not fully mastered the linguistic features required in academic writing. Some previous

studies (Widodo, 2006; Dania et al., 2024) also show that students tend to use less complex sentence structures and are limited in their use of academic vocabulary.

One way to address this gap is to pay special attention to the teaching of academic language features such as nominalization. Nominalization not only helps convey information concisely and objectively, but also increases lexical density in texts, which is an important indicator in scientific writing (Ure, 1971; Eggins, 2004). By understanding how nominalization works, students can organize information more logically and efficiently. It also helps them to construct strong and coherent arguments in the text (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008).

Furthermore, the use of nominalization is closely related to the genre-based approach that is now widely used in teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). This approach emphasizes the importance of introducing students to the structures and distinctive language features of each genre (Hyland, 2007; Martin & Rose, 2008). In the context of report texts, nominalization becomes one of the main features that distinguish it from other text types. Therefore, understanding how high school students use nominalization in their report texts is crucial to know the extent to which they have internalized such academic linguistic features.

Based on this background, this study was conducted to explore the use of nominalization in high school students' report texts, identifying the types of nominalization used, their frequency, as well as measuring the level of lexical density of their texts. The findings of this study are expected to be the basis for planning academic writing lessons that are more effective and appropriate to the needs of students at the secondary education level.

Writing is a complex productive language skill that involves critical thinking, organizing ideas, and using appropriate language structures. In the context of learning English as a foreign language (EFL), writing skills become a big challenge because it requires mastery of grammar, vocabulary, and the ability to build appropriate text structures (Nation, 2009).

Harmer (2004) states that writing in an academic context is not only about expressing ideas, but also reflects students' ability to build

arguments, maintain text cohesion and coherence, and apply academic genres appropriately. Therefore, learning writing should emphasize the whole writing process, from planning to final revision.

One of the important approaches in teaching writing is the genre-based approach. This approach emphasizes the importance of introducing students to different types of texts (genres) and their linguistic characteristics. According to Martin and Rose (2008), the genre approach not only helps students understand the organizational structure of texts, but also supports them in using appropriate language choices according to specific communicative purposes and contexts. Genres such as report, recount, discussion, and explanation have distinctive structures and linguistic features, so genre understanding is essential in academic writing.

Report Texts

Report text is a type of fact-based text that aims to convey general information about an object, phenomenon, or living thing. In the high school English curriculum in Indonesia, report text falls into the category of functional text that is oriented towards scientific and objective descriptions. The general structure of report text consists of two main parts: general classification and description (Gerot & Wignell, 1994).

This text emphasizes the use of declarative sentences, simple present tenses, and technical vocabulary that reflect its informative nature. In addition, in practice, report texts often adopt academic language features such as nominalization, passive structure, and high lexical density (Knapp & Watkins, 2005).

Nominalization

Nominalization is the process of changing from verb, adjective, or clause form to noun form. This process allows writing to be more formal, concise, and abstract, so it is often used in scientific and academic texts (Halliday & Martin, 1993). For example, the verb "analyze" can be converted into the noun "analysis," which reflects the more objective and impersonal academic process (Jaelani & Sujatna, 2014).

Tabel 1. Classification of Nominalization

No.	Nominaliaztion	Ket.
1	Quality Nominalization	from adjective to noun
2	Process Nominalization	from verb to noun
3	Circumstances Nominalization	From adv to noun
4	Relator Nominalization	From conj. to noun

Nominalization is the process of changing a word from its original function to a noun that represents a concept or entity. There are four main types of nominalization. First, quality nominalization turns adjectives that describe qualities into nouns, such as happy into happiness, so that the quality becomes an abstract concept. Second, process nominalization converts verbs that indicate action or process into nouns, for example analyze into analysis, so that the process can be discussed as an object. Third, circumstance nominalization converts prepositional phrases that describe conditions into nouns, such as in the morning into morning, which makes it easier to convey the situation concisely. Lastly, relator nominalization turns connecting words that link ideas into nouns, such as because into reason, so that the relationship or reason becomes a concept that can be analyzed. With nominalization, words that are usually descriptive or show processes turn into abstract entities that make expression and analysis easier.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach with a content analysis design. The data were in the form of ten English report texts written by grade XI students from one of the high schools in Bogor. The data collection technique was conducted through documentation. The data were analyzed by identifying the types of nominalization based on Halliday's (1998) classification and identifying the frequent used of nominalization types.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Types and Frequent Used of Nominalization Types

From the analysis of 10 students' report texts, the four types of nominalization according to Halliday (1998) were found, namely nominalization of

process (type 2), quality (type 1), state (type 3), and connective (type 4). The frequency of occurrence and percentage are shown in the following table:

Tabel 2. Result of Nominalization Types

Type of Nom	Frequency (Count)	Percentage (%)
Type 2	130	65
Type 1	50	25
Type 3	14	7
Type 4	6	3
Total	200	100

This study found that students used all four types of nominalization in writing report texts, with the dominance of the process type (Type 2), which changes verbs into nouns such as analyze into analysis. This finding is in line with Halliday's (2000) and Halliday & Matthiessen's (2004) theories, which state that process nominalization is a hallmark of scientific writing because it allows the conveyance of ideas in a more abstract, concise, and formal manner. The quality type (Type 1), which changes adjectives into nouns such as happy into happiness, is also used quite frequently, although the distribution is uneven, showing variation in the mastery of academic language features. This use of nominalization supports the characteristics of report texts according to Gerot & Wignell (2010) and Juniardi (2022), which emphasize objectivity, systematicity, and lexical density.

Although process nominalization dominates, the use of state (Type 3) and relator (Type 4) nominalization is still very minimal. Type 3 converts adverbs (e.g., time or place) into nouns, and only appears seven times in five texts. In fact, according to Halliday (2007), this type is important in scientific writing because it allows abstracting conditions or situations into discursive entities. Similarly, relator nominalization (Type 4), which turns conjunctions into nouns (e.g., because into reason), was only found four times. This reflects Halliday & Matthiessen's (2014) view that incongruent forms of expression such as this - albeit complex - are characteristic of scientific writing because they enhance abstraction and cohesion.

The lack of use of Type 3 and 4 is also supported by Mahfuduri et al. (2021) and

Jodairi Pineh (2022), who state that complex nominalizations are difficult for novice writers to master because they require advanced grammatical mastery. Most students still tend to use congruent or direct structures, which resemble spoken language and lack the formality and density of academic texts. This indicates a gap between students' linguistic competence and the demands of the report text genre. Therefore, a genre-based pedagogical approach is needed (Christie & Martin, 2000) that teaches nominalization gradually, starting from easier types such as process and quality, to more complex ones such as state and relator.

Overall, this finding confirms that mastery of nominalization-especially Type 2-is an important skill in academic writing as it supports the use of formal, objective, and information-dense language, as suggested by Halliday, Hyland (2007), and Ravelli & Ellis (2004). However, for students to be able to meet all the demands of academic genres, learning should also include other more complex types of nominalization. Teachers are advised to provide explicit teaching, authentic examples, and systematic practice in the use of all types of nominalization. By doing so, students can improve their critical thinking, text coherence, and overall scientific communication skills.

Therefore, this result reinforces the importance of explicit teaching of nominalization and enrichment of meaningful vocabulary in learning to write report texts at the high school level. By equipping students with the ability to use nominalization structures and more complex academic vocabulary, it is expected that they can increase the lexical density of their writing, so that the resulting texts are not only informative and formal, but also in accordance with academic standards that demand clarity, objectivity, and effectiveness in conveying information (Mahfudurido et al., 2021; Jalilifar et al., 2017).

CONCLUSION

This study shows that high school students have used all four types of nominalization in writing report texts, namely process, quality, state, and connective nominalization. However, process nominalization that changes verbs into abstract nouns is the most dominant type used, reflecting students' ability to apply formal and objective

academic language structures. Meanwhile, the use of state and connective nominalization is still very limited, indicating the need for more intensive and directed learning so that students are able to master more complex forms of nominalization and enrich cohesion and coherence in their writing.

REFERENCES

- Almubark, A. A. (2022). The Role of Writing in Developing Critical Thinking Skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(2), 1–10.
- Amer, B., & Baarah, H. A. (2021). Readability and Lexical Density of Reading Sections of Tenth Grade English Textbooks in Jordan and Sultanate of Oman: A Comparative Study. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 4(3), 1138–1148. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v4i3.2438>
- Bychkovska, T., & Lee, J. J. (2023). Nominalization in high- and low-rated L2 undergraduate writing. *International Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(2), 135–158.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring How Texts Work*. Sydney: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Dyan, A. Y., & Dwijatmoko, B. (2021). Implementing Genre-Based Approach in Teaching Writing to Senior High School Students. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 8(1), 102–115. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i1.20029>
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
- Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2008). Discourse functions and grammatical forms in the language of science. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 89–102.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). *On the Language of Physical Science*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2007). *Language and Society*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. London: Falmer Press.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hasibin, M., Marzulina, L., & Agustina, A. (2022). An analysis of students' ability in writing report text. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 6(2), 292–303.
<https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.6.2.292-303>
- Hancock, B. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Malaysia: Trent Focus Group.
- Hyland, K. (2007). *Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Academic Publishing: Issues and Challenges in the Construction of Knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
- Istiqomah, F., & Basthomi, Y. (2024). Exploring nominalization and lexical density deployed within research article abstracts: A grammatical metaphor analysis. *Englisia: Journal of Languages, Educations, and Humanities*, 14–28.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i2.20390>
- Jaelani, A., & Sujatna, E. T. S. (2014). The sequence of ideational grammatical metaphor wording technique in historical text: A systemic functional linguistic approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(2).
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.2p.194>
- Jalilifar, A., Alavi, S. Z., & Kamalian, K. (2017). Nominalization and Its Pedagogical Implications in Academic Writing: A Genre-Based Study of Research Articles in Applied Linguistics. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 9(19), 77–95.
- Jodairi Pineh, A. (2022). A Functional Approach to Nominalization in Academic Writing. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 6(1), 45–60.
- Mahfudurido, I., Tallapessy, A., & Kusumayanti, D. D. (2021). Exploring Nominalization Use in Graduate Thesis Abstracts: An SFL Approach to Academic Writing. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. Equinox Publishing.
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical Foundation, Basic Procedures and Software Solution*. Klagenfurt: Open Access Repository.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Ure, J. (1971). Lexical Density and Register Differentiation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5, 96–104.
- Widodo, H. P. (2006). Designing a genre-based lesson plan for an English subject. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(1), 173–199.
- Yang, X. (2006). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Beijing: Higher Education Pres